

## **Remarks**

Applicant notes with appreciation that that the Examiner has identified Claims 3-11, 26-34, 39-42, 44 and 45 as being directed to allowable subject matter. Claims 49 and 50 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.. Claims 1, 2, 12-14, 17-25, 35-38, 46-48 and 51-58 are rejected. Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed amendment and remarks is requested. Claim 46 have been cancelled. Claim 22 has been amended. Pending claims 1-14, 17-42 and 44-45 and 47-58 remain in the application.

## **ARGUMENT**

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections:**

Claims 1, 2, 12-14, 17-21, 23-25, 35-38, 46-48 and 51-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication 2004/0006621 to Bellinson et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0124252 to Schaefer et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, which should be withdrawn for at least the reasons set forth herein.

With regard to Claim 1, the Examiner admits that Bellinson et al. '621 do not explicitly disclose wherein the operator of the second computer is notified that access to the web page has been granted to the first computer. The Examiner mistakenly asserts that Schaefer et al. '252 teach notifying a second computer that access has been granted via a plurality of devices comprising a cell phone. However, Schaefer et al. does not teach the permissive use of web pages or URLs. Instead Schaefer et al. teach

“When someone has activated the television set and is attempting to view a program intended for mature audiences, the interactive video casting system may be configured to send an information alert to a parent via cellular telephone or pager. Further, if the parent desires, a message may be sent back via cellular telephone or pager (if a two-way pager) to the interactive video casting system instructing the system to block transmission of the program.”

In contrast, Claim 1 requires, in part, that

*“if the requested URL is not found in the approved table of information, enabling an operator of a second computer to determine whether to grant access of the requested URL to the first computer, wherein permitting access of the URL request by the first computer if the requested URL is found in the approved table of information further comprises:*

*accessing a Web page identified by the requested URL; and*

*routing the Web page to the first computer for browsing,*

*wherein the operator of the second computer is notified that access to the Web page has been granted to the first computer.*

In this claimed method, a user at the first computer requests access to a URL, or web page. First, Schaefer et al. do not teach web pages at the cited reference. Schaefer et al. teach parental control of television – not web pages. In the claimed method, the operator of the second computer grants access to the requested URL, and Schaefer et al. does not teach URLs. Second, the claimed method requires that the second computer be notified that that web page access has been granted. Schaefer et al. teach that access may be denied, but do not seem to teach the notification of access, as required by Claim 1. It seems that Schaefer et al. teach allowing or denying access via cell phone, but only for television viewing, and not for web pages. Also, it does not seem that Schaefer et al. teach being notified once access has been granted. Thus, the Examiner has failed to show *prima facie* evidence of obviousness because all limitations of the claims are not taught or suggested by the cited prior art. Therefore, the rejection, as regarding Claim 1 and its progeny (2, 12-14, 17-21) should be withdrawn.

As for Claim 23, as discussed above, Schaefer et al., at the cited reference, do not teach requested URLs, but merely teach requesting parentally controlled television viewing.

The rejection to Claims 24-25 and 35-38 should be withdrawn for the same reason as discussed above for Claim 1.

Claim 46 is canceled.

Claim 47 requires *“if the requested URL is not found in the approved table of information, enabling an operator of a second computer to determine whether to grant access of*

*the requested URL to the first computer, wherein the operator views at least a portion of a web page at the requested URL prior to granting or denying access.”* The Examiner asserts that Bellinson et al. teach enabling an operator of a second computer to determine whether to grant access of the requested URL to the first computer. However, neither Bellinson et al. nor Schaeffer et al. teach that the operator views at least a portion of a web page that was requested prior to granting or denying access. Thus, the rejection to Claim 47-48 and 51-54 should be withdrawn.

Claim 55 requires a *“second computer to access a Web page associated with the requested URL through a gatekeeper, the second computer to enable the first computer to access the Web page through the gatekeeper if the second computer approves the Web page for viewing on the first computer, wherein the approval is to be given automatically when the URL in an approved list, and when the URL is not in the approved list, the approval is to be given by an operator of the second computer after viewing at least a portion of the web, and at discretion of the operator.”* As discussed above, neither Bellinson et al. nor Schaefer et al. teach that the operator views at least a portion of a web page that was requested prior to granting or denying access. Further, discretion of an operator is neither taught nor suggested by the cited prior art. Bellinson et al. seem to teach only that an administrator computer 220 sets user profiles and monitors categories of web pages. The administrator computer may try to ascertain the category of a web page, but Bellinson et al. do not teach or suggest that at least a portion of the web page is viewed by an operator, and that the operator has discretion to grant or deny access to the requestor. Moreover, as also discussed above, Schaefer et al. do not teach or suggest requesting web pages, or viewing web pages, but only parental permission for television viewing. Thus, the rejection for Claims 55-58 should be withdrawn.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication 2004/0006621 to Bellinson et al. in view of US Patent Application Publication 2003/0097452 to Kim et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, which should be withdrawn for at least the reasons set forth herein.

Claim 22 is amended to require that *if the requested URL is not found in the approved table of information, dynamically enabling an operator of a second computer to determine*

*whether to grant access of the requested URL to the first computer.* The Examiner asserts that Bellinson et al. teach that a second computer may grant access to a request for a web page by a first computer. However, Bellinson et al. do not teach or suggest that an operator may dynamically determine whether to grant the request. Bellinson et al. do not teach that an operator may grant access dynamically, but only that the second computer attempts to determine the category of the requested web page and check user profiles to determine whether the web page should be granted. Further, Kim et al. do not teach or suggest, at the cited reference, that a television on a home network may be used interactively and dynamically by an operator to grant access to web pages requested on a computer on the network. Applicant believes that these references have been improperly combined and that combining their teachings will not result in Applicant's claimed invention. Therefore, the rejection to Claim 22 should be withdrawn.

Claim 49 and 50 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, it is believed that base Claim 47 is now allowable, rendering Claims 49-50 also allowable.

## **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Claims 1-14, 17-42 and 44-45 and 47-58 are all in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 633-6845. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please charge any shortage of fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-0221 and please credit any excess fees to such account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 02-Sep-2008

/Joni D. Stutman-Horn /  
Joni D. Stutman-Horn, Reg. No. 42,173  
Patent Attorney  
Intel Corporation  
(703) 633-6845

Intel Corporation  
c/o Intellevate, LLC  
P.O. Box 52050  
Minneapolis, MN 55402